1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9 10

11

12

13

14 15

17

16

18 19

20 21

22

23 24 25

27

26

28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

BRYAN EDWARD VELASQUEZ,

٧.

WILLIAM SANDIE, et al.,

Petitioner,

Respondents.

Case No. 3:16-cv-00493-MMD-VPC

ORDER

In this habeas corpus action, brought pro se by Nevada prisoner Bryan Edward Velasquez under 28 U.S.C. § 2254, the Court screened the petition for writ of habeas corpus on August 31, 2016, pursuant to Rule 4 of the Rules Governing Section 2254 Cases in the United States District Courts, and summarily dismissed the action, as it is plainly a successive habeas petition, and Velasquez has not obtained from the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals the permission required to file such a successive petition. See Order entered August 31, 2016 (ECF No. 3).

On September 15, 2016, Velasquez filed an application for a certificate of appealability (ECF No. 8). The Court denied Velasquez a certificate of appealability in the order entered August 31, 2016. (ECF No. 3.) Velasquez makes no showing warranting reconsideration of that ruling. It is beyond reasonable debate that this is a successive habeas petition, and Velasquez has not obtained from the court of appeals the necessary permission to file such a successive petition, as required under 28 U.S.C. § 2244(b)(3)(A) ("Before a second or successive application permitted by this section is

Case 3:16-cv-00493-MMD-VPC Document 9 Filed 09/21/16 Page 2 of 2

filed in the district court, the applicant shall move in the appropriate court of appeals for an order authorizing the district court to consider the application.").

The Court will, however, order that Velasquez's *pro se* application for a certificate of appealability be treated as a notice of appeal, and that it be processed accordingly by the Clerk of the Court. See *Tinsley v. Borg*, 895 F.2d 520, 523 (9th Cir.1990) (treating timely *pro se* motion for a certificate of probable cause as a timely notice of appeal).

It is therefore ordered that petitioner's application for a certificate of appealability (ECF No. 8) is denied.

It is further ordered that the Clerk of the Court will treat petitioner's application for a certificate of appealability (ECF No. 8) as a notice of appeal, and process it accordingly.

DATED THIS 21st day of September 2016.

MIRANDA M. DU UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE